

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 remain in the present application.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as reciting limitations for which an insufficient antecedent basis existed. Specifically, no antecedent basis existed for the limitations “the hydraulic supporting force” in line 6, “the liquid pressure required for producing the hydraulic supporting force” in lines 10-11, and “the liquid pressure required...” in line 10.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as reciting a limitation for which an insufficient antecedent basis existed. Specifically, no antecedent basis existed for the limitation “the means for internal support” in lines 1-2.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as reciting a limitation for which an insufficient antecedent basis existed. Specifically, no antecedent basis existed for the limitation “the means for determining” in lines 1-2.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as reciting a limitation for which an insufficient antecedent basis existed. Specifically, no antecedent basis existed for the limitation “the pneumatic pressure” in line 3.

Claims 1-5, 11 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kusters et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,046,637 (“Kusters”).

Claims 6-10 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusters as applied to claim 6, and further in view of Hornbostel, U.S. Patent No. 3,098,284 (“Hornbostel”).

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusters as applied to claim 6, and further in view of Hornbostel as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Korsch, U.S. Patent No. 3,470,948 (“Korsch”).

Claims 1, 12, 15 and 16 have now been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as reciting limitations for which an insufficient antecedent basis existed. Specifically, no antecedent basis existed for the limitations “the hydraulic supporting force” in line 6, “the liquid pressure required for producing the hydraulic supporting force” in lines 10-11, and “the liquid pressure required...” in line 10.

Claim 1 has now been amended so as to recite “a hydraulic supporting force” in line 6 and “a liquid pressure required for producing the hydraulic supporting force” in lines 10-11. The Applicants submit that these amendments now also provide antecedent basis for the limitation “the hydraulic supporting forces” in lines 10-11.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as reciting a limitation for which an insufficient antecedent basis existed. Specifically, no antecedent basis existed for the limitation “the means for internal support” in lines 1-2.

Claim 12 has now been amended so as to recite “a means for internal support” in lines 1-2.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as reciting a limitation for which an insufficient antecedent basis existed. Specifically, no antecedent basis existed for the limitation “the means for determining” in lines 1-2.

Claim 15 has now been amended so as to recite “a means for determining” in lines 1-2.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as reciting a limitation for which an insufficient antecedent basis existed. Specifically, no antecedent basis existed for the limitation “the pneumatic pressure” in line 3.

Claim 16 has now been amended so as to recite “a pneumatic pressure” in line 3.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-5, 11 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kusters et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,046,637 (“Kusters”).

Kusters describes a roller for the pressure treatment of a material in web form where the roller has a core 2 rotating with the hollow cylinder 1, the gap between the core 2 and the hollow cylinder 1 being separated into chambers formed by pockets containing tubes of resilient material adjacent to one another and arranged parallel to the axis of the roller. See Kusters, column 1, lines 11-12 and lines 50-55, column 2, lines 24-26 and lines 62-63.

Independent claim 1 of the present invention has now been amended to recite a roll for the pressure treatment of material bands with “a carrier (3) mounted in a rotationally fixed manner on a machine frame” and “a roll shell (4) mounted around the carrier (3), the roll sheet (4) being configured so as to rotate around the carrier (3).” Support for the amendment can be found, for example, on page 6, lines 15-20 of the application where it is stated that “[t]he roll 100 according to the invention comprises a carrier 3, which is mounted

in a rotationally fixed manner on a machine frame (not represented in the drawing). Mounted rotatably around the carrier 3 is a roll shell 4, the outer lateral surface 5 of which forms the working circumference 6 of the roll 100.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Kusters does not describe a carrier (3) mounted in a rotationally fixed manner on a machine frame or a roll shell (4) mounted around the carrier (3), the roll sheet (4) being configured so as to rotate around the carrier (3). In contrast, Kusters repeatedly describes a roller where the core 2 (the carrier (3) of the present invention) rotates with the hollow cylinder 1 (the roll shell (4) of the present invention). See Kusters, column 1, lines 50-55, column 2, lines 24-26 and lines 62-63. Kusters therefore does not anticipate amended independent claim 1 of the present invention. Claims 2-5, 11 and 13-15, by virtue of their dependence on amended independent claim 1, are likewise not anticipated by Kusters.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5, 11 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Kusters is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 6-10 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6-10 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusters as applied to claim 6, and further in view of Hornbostel, U.S. Patent No. 3,098,284 (“Hornbostel”).

Kusters was described above.

Hornbostel describes a structure for a roll 21 whose axis is subject to deflection in response to a load. The roll 21 is mounted with conventional allochiral heads and stub shafts 22, 23 rotatably carried in bearings 24, 25. See Hornbostel, column 1, lines 8-9, column 3, lines 66-70 and Fig. 3.

It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 6-10 and 15-16 properly depend from independent claim 1. As stated above, Kusters fails to teach or suggest at least the features of a roll for the pressure treatment of material bands with a carrier (3) mounted in a rotationally fixed manner on a machine frame and a roll shell (4) mounted around the carrier (3), the roll sheet (4) being configured so as to rotate around the carrier (3). Hornbostel does not cure this defect. In contrast, Hornbostel describes a roll 21 which is mounted with conventional allochiral heads and stub shafts 22, 23 rotatably carried in bearings 24, 25. See

Hornbostel, column 1, lines 8-9, column 3, lines 66-70 and Fig. 3. Hornbostel therefore teaches a rotatably mounted roll, and not a carrier mounted in a rotationally fixed manner on a machine frame where the roll sheet is configured so as to rotate around the carrier as is required by independent claim 1.

Because each of Kusters and Hornbostel are missing at least the features of a roll for the pressure treatment of material bands with a carrier (3) mounted in a rotationally fixed manner on a machine frame and a roll shell (4) mounted around the carrier (3), the roll sheet (4) being configured so as to rotate around the carrier (3), as is recited in independent claim 1 of the present application, it is respectfully submitted that any combination of Kusters and Hornbostel, to the extent proper, could not render obvious dependent claims 6-10 and 15-16.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 6-10 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kusters in view of Hornbostel is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusters as applied to claim 6, and further in view of Hornbostel as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Korsch, U.S. Patent No. 3,470,948 ("Korsch").

Kusters and Hornbostel were described above.

Korsch describes a roller structure comprising a roller body 3 and a roller shaft 4 eccentrically located within the roller body in a spaced relationship thereto while inflatable means are located between the roller body and roller shaft. The roller body 3 and roller shaft 4 are coupled to each other so as to rotate at the same speed. See Korsch, column 1, lines 13-27, column 2, lines 20-21, and column 4, lines 33-36.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 12 properly depends from independent claim 1. As stated above, Kusters and Hornbostel each fail to teach or suggest at least the features of a roll for the pressure treatment of material bands with a carrier (3) mounted in a rotationally fixed manner on a machine frame and a roll shell (4) mounted around the carrier (3), the roll sheet (4) being configured so as to rotate around the carrier (3). Korsch does not cure this defect. In contrast, Korsch describes a roller where the roller body 3 (the roll sheet (4) of the present invention) and the roller shaft 4 (the carrier (3) of the present invention) are

coupled to each other so as to rotate at the same speed. See Korsch, column 1, lines 13-27, column 2, lines 20-21, and column 4, lines 33-36. Korsch therefore teaches a rotatably mounted roll, and not a carrier mounted in a rotationally fixed manner on a machine frame where the roll sheet is configured so as to rotate around the carrier as is required by independent claim 1.

Because each of Kusters, Hornbostel and Korsch are missing at least the features of a roll for the pressure treatment of material bands with a carrier (3) mounted in a rotationally fixed manner on a machine frame and a roll shell (4) mounted around the carrier (3), the roll sheet (4) being configured so as to rotate around the carrier (3), as is recited in independent claim 1 of the present application, it is respectfully submitted that any combination of Kusters, Hornbostel and Korsch, to the extent proper, could not render obvious dependent claim 12.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kusters in view of Hornbostel and further in view of Korsch is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. Should the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determine that additional fees are owed or that any refund is owed for this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge the required fee(s) and/or credit the refund(s) owed to our Deposit Account No. 50-5256.

Dated: April 18, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By *Norman B. Thot*
Norman B. Thot

Registration No.: 47,993
PATENT LAW OFFICES OF
DR. NORMAN B. THOT
P.O. Box 10 17 56
40837 Ratingen / Germany
(+49 2102) 168928-0
(+49 2102) 168928-20 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants